



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,839	04/18/2005	Shlomo Rabinovitch	Tsivion P6US0	2225
37190 7590 02/17/2009 VARNUM, RIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT LLP 333 BRIDGE STREET, NW P.O. BOX 352 GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49501-0352				
EXAMINER				
POPHAM, JEFFREY D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2437				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/17/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/531,839

Applicant(s)

RABINOVITCH, SHLOMO

Examiner

JEFFREY D. POPHAM

Art Unit

2437

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/ISD)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

Remarks

Claims 1-41 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Examples of the kinds of issues within the claims are as follows. These are merely exemplary and are not nearly all of the issues, however, all must be fixed. Claim 2 lacks antecedent basis for "the at least one builder sub-system". Claim 3 stops short, not actually providing a full or meaningful limitation. Claim 10 has more than ten antecedent basis issues. Claim 10 doesn't say whether the limitations are all included ("and") or only one must be included for the claim ("or"), merely listing the limitations without any joining word or phrases such as the above. Claim 11 refers to a flexible structure component (which is data) that "comprises a dynamic working area to the storage update and retrieval", which makes no sense. Claim 23 refers to the flexible structure component as having a unique physical structure, but as just stated, it is data, and not physical. Claim 26 refers to "substantially continuously" examining, which does

not clearly define the bounds of the claim. Claims 1 and 28 state things like "an at least one remote client device" or "an at least one flexible structure component". These are either one ("an") or at least one ("at least one"), but something cannot be a single piece of data which is also a plurality of the same piece of data at the same time. The language must be clarified. Claim 28 refers to requesting remote locations and the like in ambiguous terms, providing antecedent basis issues and not clearly defining which remote location is being referred to, since the claim refers to multiple distinct remote locations for which separate processing may be performed. Claim 33 claims dependence from claim 32, but a wide area network cannot be a local area network. Other claims have issues related to those discussed above and, perhaps, other issues as well. It is once again noted that the above list is merely exemplary, and there are many other issues in the claims that must be fixed. There may also be 101 issues in the claims, however, since the claims are indefinite, the claims will be reviewed for such issues once amended in a clear and definite form, defining the scope of the claims for which protection is sought. The Examiner has rejected the claims below as they can best be understood in current form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3-7, 15, 18, 21, 22, 26-33, 35-37, and 39-41 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by England (U.S. Patent 6,330,670).

Regarding Claim 1,

England discloses in a communications and computing environment having at least one server device linked communicatively via a communications network to at least one remote client device, a system for secure distribution of digital products and secure control management of digital product usage rights, the system comprising the elements of:

At least flexible structure component comprising digital content information and digital content usage control information in an integrative manner (Figure 2; Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16);

At least one digital product content data record to store original digital content information to be assembled and integrated into the at least one flexible structure component (Figure 2; Column 10, lines 14-25; e.g. content 221 or portion thereof);

At least one digital product control data record to store digital content usage control information to be assembled and integrated into the at least one flexible structure component (Figure 2; Column 10, lines 14-

25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16; e.g. license 223 or portion thereof, or access predicate 222 or portion thereof);

At least one parameter file to hold component access functional extensions to be assembled and integrated dynamically into the at least one flexible structure component (Figure 2; Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16; e.g. access predicate 222 or portion thereof, or license 223 or portion thereof);

At least one builder component to assemble and create the at least one flexible structure component using the at least one digital product content data record, the at least one digital product content usage control data record and the at least one parameter file (Figure 2; and Column 10, lines 14-25); and

At least one flexible structure component controller to control the operation of the at least one flexible structure component (Figure 2; Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16; e.g. DRMOS 205).

Regarding Claim 3,

England discloses that the flexible structure component is dynamic, whereby protection against the activities of unauthorized entities attempting to achieve illegal manipulation (Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16).

Regarding Claim 4,

England discloses that the digital product content data is encoded by at least one encoder function and by at least one encryption key (Column 10, lines 4-25; and Column 20, lines 40-57).

Regarding Claim 5,

England discloses that the at least one digital product content data record is an electronic document (Column 1, lines 52-61; and Column 18, lines 39-54).

Regarding Claim 6,

England discloses that the at least one digital product content data record is a video recording (Column 1, lines 52-61; and Column 18, lines 39-54).

Regarding Claim 7,

England discloses that the at least one digital product content data record is an audio recording (Column 1, lines 52-61; and Column 18, lines 39-54).

Regarding Claim 15,

England discloses that the at least one parameter file comprises the elements of: at least digital product access control function; at least one digital product access parameter; at least one flexible structure component structure definition; at least one defense mechanism to prevent unauthorized usage, unrestricted access, and illegal tampering (Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16).

Regarding Claim 18,

England discloses that the at least one client device is a personal computer (Column 5, lines 51-61).

Regarding Claim 21,

England discloses that the at least one client device is a portable player device (Column 5, lines 51-61).

Regarding Claim 22,

England discloses that the at least one client device is a set top box/digital video player (Column 2, lines 33-45; and Column 5, lines 51-61).

Regarding Claim 26,

England discloses a watch-dog function to examine substantially continuously an appropriate operation of the flexible structure component and the flexible structure component controller (Column 15, line 48 to Column 16, line 49; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16).

Regarding Claim 27,

England discloses that parts constituting the flexible structure component form a securely distributable and controllable digital product (Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16).

Regarding Claim 28,

England discloses in a communications and computing environment having at least one server device linked communicatively via

a communications network to at least one remote client device, a method for secure distribution of digital products and secure control of digital product usage rights, the method comprising the steps of:

Dynamically assembling at least one flexible structure component comprising a digital product and having a unique structure by at least one builder subsystem utilizing at least one digital product content record, at least one digital product control record and at least one parameter file (Figure 2; Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16);

Distributing the at least one assembled flexible structure component to a requesting remote location/remote client device associated with a specific element of a digital product supply chain (Column 10, lines 14-40; and Column 10, line 10 to Column 20, line 16);

Defining the content usage rights of the at least one flexible structure component for the requesting remote location/remote client device prior to further distribution to requesting remote locations or remote client devices (Column 10, lines 14-40; and Column 10, line 10 to Column 20, line 16);

Delegating rights for defining content usage rights for requesting remote locations or remote client devices prior to further distribution to requesting remote locations/remote client devices (Column 10, lines 14-40; and Column 10, line 10 to Column 20, line 16); and

Securely controlling operation of the flexible structure component by at least one flexible structure component controller (Column 10, lines 14-40; and Column 10, line 10 to Column 20, line 16).

Regarding Claim 29,

England discloses that definition of usage rights is performed without establishment of a communication link to a supplier remote location/controller remote location (Column 10, lines 14-40; and Column 10, line 10 to Column 20, line 16).

Regarding Claim 30,

England discloses that delegation of rights for defining content usage rights is performed without establishment of a communication link to a supplier remote location/controller remote location (Column 10, lines 14-40; and Column 10, line 10 to Column 20, line 16).

Regarding Claim 31,

England discloses that the communications network is a data network (Figure 1; and Column 6, line 56 to Column 7, line 20).

Regarding Claim 32,

England discloses that the communications network is a WAN (Figure 1; and Column 6, line 56 to Column 7, line 20).

Regarding Claim 33,

England discloses that the communications network is a LAN (Figure 1; and Column 6, line 56 to Column 7, line 20).

Regarding Claim 35,

England discloses that the element of the digital product supply chain is a digital product owner or digital product distributor (Column 10, lines 14-40; and Column 10, line 10 to Column 20, line 16).

Regarding Claim 36,

England discloses that the element of the digital product supply chain is a reseller (Column 10, lines 14-40; and Column 10, line 10 to Column 20, line 16).

Regarding Claim 37,

England discloses that an element of a digital product distribution network is a consumer (Column 10, lines 14-40; and Column 10, line 10 to Column 20, line 16).

Regarding Claim 39,

England discloses that basic product rules, definitions, and limitations are defined by a digital product owner or a digital product distributor in a comprehensive manner and are embedded into the digital product during assembling of the flexible structure component (Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16).

Regarding Claim 40,

England discloses that a reseller element of a digital product chain is provided with a capability of enhanced control concerning digital product

usage rights (Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16).

Regarding Claim 41,

England discloses that a consumer element of the digital product supply chain is provided with a capability of limited control concerning digital product usage rights (Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2, 8, 9, 16, 17, 19, 20, 34, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England in view of Muyres (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0010046).

Regarding Claim 2,

England does not explicitly disclose at least one add-on data record to be assembled and integrated into the at least one flexible structure component by the at least one builder component.

Muyres, however, discloses at least one add-on data record to be assembled and integrated into the at least one flexible structure

component by the at least one builder component (Paragraphs 148-150, 216, and 285). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the content management system of Muyres into the content protection system of England in order to allow vendors, retailers, sellers, etc. of many varieties of digital content can participate in the system, allow clients of many varieties to obtain access to a wide array of content, and/or to allow users to easily browse various providers and content via a centralized system, as opposed to visiting each provider separately.

Regarding Claim 8,

England does not explicitly disclose that the at least one digital product content data record is a software application.

Muyres, however, discloses that the at least one digital product content data record is a software application (Paragraph 64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the content management system of Muyres into the content protection system of England in order to allow vendors, retailers, sellers, etc. of many varieties of digital content can participate in the system, allow clients of many varieties to obtain access to a wide array of content, and/or to allow users to easily browse various providers and content via a centralized system, as opposed to visiting each provider separately.

Regarding Claim 9,

England does not explicitly disclose that the at least one digital product content data record is in a rich media format.

Muyres, however, discloses that the at least one digital product content data record is in a rich media format (Paragraphs 121-122). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the content management system of Muyres into the content protection system of England in order to allow vendors, retailers, sellers, etc. of many varieties of digital content can participate in the system, allow clients of many varieties to obtain access to a wide array of content, and/or to allow users to easily browse various providers and content via a centralized system, as opposed to visiting each provider separately.

Regarding Claim 16,

England discloses at least client application, at least one video player, at least one audio player (Column 18, lines 39-54); but does not explicitly disclose at least one network browser and at least one text processor.

Muyres, however, discloses at least one network browser and at least one text processor (Paragraphs 8, 15, 133-135, 164-166, 285, and 356). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the content management

system of Muyres into the content protection system of England in order to allow vendors, retailers, sellers, etc. of many varieties of digital content can participate in the system, allow clients of many varieties to obtain access to a wide array of content, and/or to allow users to easily browse various providers and content via a centralized system, as opposed to visiting each provider separately.

Regarding Claim 17,

England discloses that the at least one builder component comprises the elements of a communication system interface (Figure 2; Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16); but does not explicitly disclose a billing system interface and an archiving system interface.

Muyres, however, discloses that the at least one builder component comprises the elements of a billing system interface, an archiving system interface, a communication system interface (Figures 12A-12C; Paragraphs 155-162). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the content management system of Muyres into the content protection system of England in order to allow vendors, retailers, sellers, etc. of many varieties of digital content can participate in the system, allow clients of many varieties to obtain access to a wide array of content, and/or to allow users

to easily browse various providers and content via a centralized system, as opposed to visiting each provider separately.

Regarding Claim 19,

England does not explicitly disclose that the at least one client device is a mobile phone device.

Muyres, however, discloses that the at least one client device is a mobile phone device (Paragraphs 15, 86-88, and 356). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the content management system of Muyres into the content protection system of England in order to allow vendors, retailers, sellers, etc. of many varieties of digital content can participate in the system, allow clients of many varieties to obtain access to a wide array of content, and/or to allow users to easily browse various providers and content via a centralized system, as opposed to visiting each provider separately.

Regarding Claim 20,

England does not explicitly disclose that the at least one client device is a play station device.

Muyres, however, discloses that the at least one client device is a play station device (Paragraphs 15 and 356). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the content management system of Muyres into the content

protection system of England in order to allow vendors, retailers, sellers, etc. of many varieties of digital content can participate in the system, allow clients of many varieties to obtain access to a wide array of content, and/or to allow users to easily browse various providers and content via a centralized system, as opposed to visiting each provider separately.

Regarding Claim 34,

England does not explicitly disclose that the communications network is a cellular network.

Muyres, however, discloses that the communications network is a cellular network (Paragraphs 15, 86-88, and 356). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the content management system of Muyres into the content protection system of England in order to allow vendors, retailers, sellers, etc. of many varieties of digital content can participate in the system, allow clients of many varieties to obtain access to a wide array of content, and/or to allow users to easily browse various providers and content via a centralized system, as opposed to visiting each provider separately.

Regarding Claim 38,

England does not explicitly disclose that a service device is linked to a digital product archive.

Muyres, however, discloses that a service device is linked to a digital product archive (Paragraphs 155-159). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the content management system of Muyres into the content protection system of England in order to allow vendors, retailers, sellers, etc. of many varieties of digital content can participate in the system, allow clients of many varieties to obtain access to a wide array of content, and/or to allow users to easily browse various providers and content via a centralized system, as opposed to visiting each provider separately.

4. Claims 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England in view of Muyres and Debiez (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0126440).

Regarding Claim 10,

England discloses that the at least one flexible structure component comprises the elements of:

A component version descriptor for storing of a type, version, and identification of a component (Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16);

A component structure descriptor for storing a description and allocation of diverse parts of a component (Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16);

A rules and rights descriptor (Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16);

At least one digital content data record (Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16);

An encryption key to be used for encrypting the digital product content record (Column 10, lines 4-25; and Column 20, lines 40-57);

A component access functionality extension (Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16);

But does not explicitly disclose at least additional data record to store advertising material, promotions, translations, and comments, an encryption key to be used for encrypting the digital product content record, a stamp creation formula to be used for a calculation of stamps; a stamp checker function to check availability and validity of stamps; a stamp registration function; at least one stamp parameter to define a manner of stamp calculation; at least one stamp record; a registration stamp record to signify suitable registration of the flexible structure component; a final stamp record to store a value representing a sum of at least one stamp.

Muyres, however, discloses at least additional data record to store advertising material, promotions, translations, and comments, and an encryption key to be used for encrypting the digital product content record (Figures 12A-12C; Paragraphs 148-150, 216, and 285). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the content management system of Muyres into the content protection system of England in order to allow vendors,

retailers, sellers, etc. of many varieties of digital content can participate in the system, allow clients of many varieties to obtain access to a wide array of content, and/or to allow users to easily browse various providers and content via a centralized system, as opposed to visiting each provider separately.

Debiez, however, discloses a stamp creation formula to be used for a calculation of stamps; a stamp checker function to check availability and validity of stamps; a stamp registration function; at least one stamp parameter to define a manner of stamp calculation; at least one stamp record; a registration stamp record to signify suitable registration of the flexible structure component; a final stamp record to store a value representing a sum of at least one stamp (Paragraphs 28-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the cumulative hash function of Debiez into the content protection system of England as modified by Muyres in order to provide a data integrity check method using a cumulative hash function that allows detection of data modification when a block of data and associated hash are replaced, thus allowing for a strong determination of data integrity.

Regarding Claim 14,

England as modified by Muyres and Debiez discloses the system of claim 10, in addition, Muyres discloses at least one add-on information

record to hold advertisement information, comment information, translation information, and promotion information (Paragraphs 148-150, 216, and 285).

5. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England in view of Muyres and Debiez, further in view of Elteto (U.S. Patent 6,463,538).

Regarding Claim 11,

England as modified by Muyres and Debiez discloses the system of claim 10, in addition, England discloses that the flexible structure component further comprises a dynamic working area to storage, update, and retrieval of accounting, tracking, camouflage data and working parameters (Column 10, lines 14-25; and Column 19, line 10 to Column 20, line 16).

Elteto also discloses camouflage data (Column 4, line 17 to Column 5, line 15; and Column 5, line 57 to Column 6, line 16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the protection system of Elteto into the content protection system of England as modified by Muyres and Debiez in order to allow the system randomly change various protection mechanisms and attributes, thereby forcing a potential adversary to analyze, understand and, if possible, hack each and every piece of protected content

individually, thus multiplying the effort and time necessary to disable or remove protection of content.

Regarding Claim 12,

England as modified by Muyres and Debiez may not explicitly disclose that the flexible structure component further comprises at least one camouflage data record to be used for camouflaging the digital product content record.

Elteto, however, discloses that the flexible structure component further comprises at least one camouflage data record to be used for camouflaging the digital product content record (Column 4, line 17 to Column 5, line 15; and Column 5, line 57 to Column 6, line 16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the protection system of Elteto into the content protection system of England as modified by Muyres and Debiez in order to allow the system randomly change various protection mechanisms and attributes, thereby forcing a potential adversary to analyze, understand and, if possible, hack each and every piece of protected content individually, thus multiplying the effort and time necessary to disable or remove protection of content.

Regarding Claim 13,

England as modified by Muyres and Debiez may not explicitly disclose that the flexible structure component further comprises at least

one camouflage function to hide specific information and to prevent identification of content headers

Elteto, however, discloses that the flexible structure component further comprises at least one camouflage function to hide specific information and to prevent identification of content headers (Column 4, line 17 to Column 5, line 15; and Column 5, line 57 to Column 6, line 16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the protection system of Elteto into the content protection system of England as modified by Muyres and Debiez in order to allow the system randomly change various protection mechanisms and attributes, thereby forcing a potential adversary to analyze, understand and, if possible, hack each and every piece of protected content individually, thus multiplying the effort and time necessary to disable or remove protection of content.

6. Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over England in view of Elteto.

Regarding Claim 23,

England may not explicitly disclose that the at least one flexible structure component is provided with a unique structure, a unique combination of operative object and a unique combination of defensive mechanism.

Elteto, however, discloses that the at least one flexible structure component is provided with a unique structure, a unique combination of operative object and a unique combination of defensive mechanism (Column 4, line 17 to Column 5, line 15; and Column 5, line 57 to Column 6, line 16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the protection system of Elteto into the content protection system of England in order to allow the system randomly change various protection mechanisms and attributes, thereby forcing a potential adversary to analyze, understand and, if possible, hack each and every piece of protected content individually, thus multiplying the effort and time necessary to disable or remove protection of content.

Regarding Claim 24,

England may not explicitly disclose a language scheme to provide for secure communication between the at least one builder component and the at least one flexible structure component controller.

Elteto, however, discloses a language scheme to provide for secure communication between the at least one builder component and the at least one flexible structure component controller (Column 4, line 17 to Column 5, line 15; and Column 5, line 57 to Column 6, line 16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the protection system of Elteto into the

content protection system of England in order to allow the system randomly change various protection mechanisms and attributes, thereby forcing a potential adversary to analyze, understand and, if possible, hack each and every piece of protected content individually, thus multiplying the effort and time necessary to disable or remove protection of content.

Regarding Claim 25,

England as modified by Elteto discloses the system of claim 24, in addition, in addition, Elteto discloses that the language scheme is updated periodically (Column 4, line 17 to Column 5, line 15; and Column 5, line 57 to Column 6, line 16).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY D. POPHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey D Popham
Examiner
Art Unit 2437

/Jeffrey D Popham/
Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437